

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Final action mailed March 6, 2008, claims 1 – 16, 19, 21 – 24, and 26 were rejected and claim 20 was objected to. In response, Applicants propose amending claim 15 and canceling claims 19 and 20. Applicants respectfully request that the amendments be entered to put the claims in condition for allowance. Applicants hereby requests reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and the below-provided remarks. No claims have been added or canceled.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's review of and determination that claim 20 recites allowable subject matter. In particular, the Office Action states that claim 20 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response, Applicants have amended claim 15 to incorporate the limitations of claims 19 and 20. Claims 19 and 20 are canceled. Applicants assert that amended claim 15 is in an allowable condition.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1 – 16, 19, 22 – 24, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ochiai et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,107,698, hereinafter Ochiai).

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites:

“A standby circuit for an electrical device ***having***
one or more signal inputs and
a control unit and
a control output for the control of a power supply unit,
in which the control unit initiates an activation procedure on the
occurrence of a predefined activation event at the signal input,
in which a signal to switch on a power supply unit is generated at the
control output;
further comprising ***a programming interface for programming the***
control unit, wherein the programming determines how the control unit responds
to inputs from the one or more signal inputs.” (emphasis added)

That is, the standby circuit has a programming interface for programming the control unit.

Applicants assert that Ochiai does not disclose a standby circuit that has a programming interface as recited in claim 1. The Final action cites Ochiai's micro-computer (24) as disclosing a programming interface as recited in claim 1. In particular, the Final action states "Ochiai's micro-computer comprises a CPU which *[is]* inherently programmable." (Final action, page 2)

Although Ochiai discloses a micro-computer (24) in Fig. 1, Ochiai does not disclose that the main unit (100) has an interface that is used to program the micro-computer (24) as recited in claim 1. With reference to Fig. 1 of Ochiai, the main unit (100) does not include a programming interface for programming the micro-computer (24). Further, the micro-computer includes various inputs (power supply input terminal 240, first infrared signal detection terminal 241, detection terminal 243, and detection terminal 245), none of which are described as being a programming interface for programming the micro-computer (24).

Even though Ochiai discloses a micro-computer that is inherently programmable, nowhere does Ochiai disclose that the main unit (100) includes a programming interface for programming the micro-computer (24) once it is installed into the main unit (100). Because the main unit (100) of Ochiai does not include a programming interface, Applicants assert that the micro-computer is most likely programmed before the micro-computer is installed into the main unit (100). Just because the micro-computer (24) is programmable does not necessarily mean that main unit includes a programming interface for programming the micro-computer.

Because Ochiai does not disclose a standby circuit that has an interface that is used to program the micro-computer (24), Applicants assert that claim 1 is not anticipated by Ochiai.

Dependent claim 14

Dependent claim 14 recites:

“A standby circuit as claimed in claim 1, in which
a store stores remote control activation signals,
the control unit compares signals arriving at the remote control input
with the stored activation signals,
and if they match initiates the activation procedure.”

In the Final action, the support for the rejection of claim 14 is “Claims 13 – 14, Ochiai teaches the control unit forwards the signals arriving at the remote control input via a communication terminal [Fig. 1].” (Final action, page 3, item 14) Applicants assert that claim 14 is not anticipated by Ochiai because Ochiai does not disclose the limitations of claim 14. Further, Applicants point out that the rejection of claim 14 is improper because the rejection does not address any of the limitations of claim 14. In view of the above, Applicant’s respectfully request that the rejection of claim 14 be withdrawn. Further, Applicants respectfully request that if a new rejection is issued, the new rejection should not be made Final as any new rejection has not been necessitated by an amendment.

Independent Claim 22

Independent claim 22 recites “*bi-directional data exchange occurs between the standby circuit and the one or more functional units.*” In the Final action, the above-identified limitation of claim 22 was rejected in view of “photo-coupler 34 of Figs. 1 – 3 and related disclosure.” (Final action, page 4, item 17) Firstly, Applicants assert that “photo-coupler 34” does not exist in Figs. 1 – 3 of Ochiai. Applicants respectfully point out that the reference to “photo-coupler 34 of Figs. 1 – 3 and related disclosure” appears to be a reference to the Erba reference (U.S. Pat. No. 6,292,233) that was cited in the previous Final action dated November 27, 2007.

Secondly, Ochiai does disclose bi-directional communication between the main unit (100) and the remote controller (12), see Fig. 1. However, claim 22 recites that “*bi-directional data exchange occurs between the standby circuit and the one or more functional units*” and that the electrical device includes at least one power supply for feeding the functional units with electrical energy. While Ochiai does disclose bi-

direction communication between the main unit (100) and the remote controller (12), the remote controller is not powered by the main power supply circuit (2) or the stand-by power supply circuit (22) of the main unit (100). As is well known in the field, the remote controller (12) likely includes its own power supply, such as a battery. Therefore, the bi-directional communication between the main unit (100) and the remote controller (12) does not disclose bi-directional data exchange between the standby circuit and the one or more functional units (which are powered by a power supply of the electrical device).

In sum, although Ochiai discloses bi-directional communication between the main unit (100) and the remote controller (12), Ochiai does not disclose the structure to support bi-directional data exchange as recited in claim 22. Because Ochiai does not disclose every limitation of claim 22, Applicants assert that claim 22 is not anticipated by Ochiai.

Independent Claim 26

Independent claim 26 recites an electrical device that includes “a data bus that enables bi-directional data communications between the standby circuit and one or more of the functional units.” As described above with reference to Fig. 22, Ochiai discloses bi-directional communication between the main unit (100) and the remote controller (12). Although Ochiai discloses bi-directional communication between the main unit (100) and the remote controller (12), Ochiai does not disclose a data bus that enables bi-directional data communications as recited in claim 26. Because Ochiai does not disclose every limitation of claim 26, Applicants assert that claim 26 is not anticipated by Ochiai.

Dependent Claims 2 – 14, 16, 21, 23, and 24

Claims 2 – 14 are dependent on claim 1, claims 16, and 19 – 21 are dependent on claim 15, and claims 23 and 24 are dependent on claim 22. Applicants assert that these claims are allowable at least based on an allowable base claim.

Additionally, Applicants assert that remarks made above with reference to claim 1 apply also to claim 24. Claim 24 recites in part that “the standby circuit is programmed by way of a communication interface.” As recited above with reference to claim 1,

Applicants assert that the main unit (100) does not include an interface for programming the standby circuit.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the amendments and remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-3444** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-3444** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: May 6, 2008

Mark A. Wilson
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham
PMB: 348
2530 Berryessa Road
San Jose, CA 95132
Phone: (925) 249-1300
Fax: (925) 249-0111